

LEWIS—WIGGINS
DEBATE
ON THE
GODHEAD

BILLY LEWIS
(United Pentecostal Church)

STEPHEN WIGGINS
(Church of Christ)

WIGGINS' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Billy Lewis, minister of the Frayser United Pentecostal Church in Memphis, Tennessee, and myself have agreed to engage in a written debate on the subject of the Godhead.

PROPOSITION DEFINED

It is my duty as the first affirmative writer to begin by defining the proposition in such a way as to clarify the meaning of every significant word. The proposition is given and defined **as follows**. Resolved: **The Bible teaches that there are three separate and distinct persons In the Godhead, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.** By the **Bible**, I mean the inspired word of God inclusive of both Old and Now Testaments. By **teaches** I mean to instruct or to impart knowledge. By **three**, I mean the simple numerical designation. By **separate and distinct**, I mean different or distinguishable. By **persons**, I mean self-rational, self-conscious beings having will or volition who may act or be acted upon. By **Godhead**, I mean deity, divinity, or divine nature as used in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, and Colossians 2:9. By **namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit** I mean to designate the members of the Godhead or those characterized by divine nature.

The point of doctrinal difference between Mr. Lewis and myself in this debate is the number of members that comprise the Godhead. I believe that the Bible teaches that God (or the Godhead) is composed of three distinct members, each of whom possesses the nature or quality which identifies one as deity. These three distinct members or personalities who share this one divine nature are characterized in the Bible as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. My opponent, however, believes that God (or the Godhead) is composed of only one being. The reader should clearly understand that I am not saying that there are three Gods. I do not believe in three Gods. This is not the issue of this debate. Mr. Lewis and I both unquestionably believe that the Bible teaches there is but one God. We differ as to how many compose the one God or possess this divine nature. I believe there are three that comprise deity while Mr. Lewis believes there is only one. We bid you to read the debate with care.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #1

My first argument consists of setting forth proof that all three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are referred to as God in the Bible. The word "God" is a name of the divine nature or quality of being (as opposed, for example, to the angelic or human natures). Therefore, when the Bible says there is but one God, the meaning is that there is but one divine nature. And because there is but one divine nature, it follows there is but one God. The Bible reveals that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit each possess the quality or nature of deity. Thus, each is called God. (1) The Father is called God. In John 6:27 Jesus referred to the Father as "God the Father". The apostle Peter likewise refers to the Father as "God the Father" in 2 Peter 1:17. (2) But the Son is also called God. In Hebrews 1:8, the Father refers to his Son as God: "But unto the Son he saith, thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." And why is the Son called God also? Because he, too, possesses the attributes of deity that identify one as God. (3) Again, the Holy Spirit is also called God. In Acts 5:3-4, Peter made it clear that Ananias had lied to God by lying to the Holy Spirit. **All** three are referred to as God (deity, divinity) because all three possess the divine nature—the attributes or characteristics of deity. There is but **one** divine nature (God), but there are **three** persons possessing this unified set of infinite qualities.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #2

My next argument is taken from Ephesians 4:4–6. Here the apostle Paul names seven items of which he says in each case there is **one**: one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all. Among these he mentions **one Spirit**, **one Lord**, and **one God and–Father**, which, when added together makes **three**. Notice the following chart where I have extracted these three that relate to the Godhead.

one body 1

one Spirit 1

one hope 1

one Lord 1

one faith 1

one baptism 1

one Father 1

Of the seven items that Paul here listed, he emphasizes by repetition (seven times) that there is one of each. Thus, if there is one body, one hope, one faith, and one baptism, it is clear that there is **one of each** of these four items. This being true, none of these (the body, the hope, the faith, and the baptism) are the same. They are all different because there is one of each. Similarly, it is true with the other three, which relate to the Godhead. There is one of each, which, when added together makes three.

Now, here is how this argument relates to the proof of my proposition: just as the one body, the one hope, the one faith, and the one baptism, are different items and not the same, so it is with the other three that pertain to the Godhead. The body is not the same as the hope; the hope is not the same as the faith; the faith is not the same as the baptism; and neither is the one Spirit the same as the one Lord; and the one Lord is not the same as the one Father. There are three, and they are different. Though all three possess the divine nature as I proved from argument #1, yet they are different and distinguishable.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #3

This argument is taken from Matthew 3:16–17, which records the baptismal scene of Jesus. On this occasion, the three persons of the Godhead are easily noted. The reader should carefully observe that the following three events were immediately associated together so that it is clear that they took place simultaneously. (1) The Son is on earth coming up out of the waters of baptism. (2) The Holy Spirit is descending from heaven to earth in a bodily form as a dove. (3) The Father is in heaven who speaks, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The owner of the voice who spoke from heaven could not have been Jesus on earth. For the very moment the voice spoke, the Son was on earth praying, not in heaven (Lk. 3:22–23). But neither could it have been the Holy Spirit. For at the very moment the voice spoke from heaven, the Holy Spirit was in the process of descending to the earth. However, the context of the message clearly identifies the heavenly voice as belonging to the Father, for he said of Jesus,

"This is **my** beloved **Son**." On another similar occasion, at the Transfiguration, the heavenly voice came again expressing the good pleasure in his Son (Matt. 17:5). The apostle Peter was there and heard the voice. He later identified the voice as coming from none other than "God the Father" (2 Pet. 1:17–18). This is exactly who also spoke at the baptism of his Son and the descending of the Holy Spirit.

It is obvious from the above that neither Jesus nor the Holy Spirit is the same person as the Father who spoke from heaven. But it is likewise true that Jesus and the Holy Spirit are not the same person. For, it was Jesus on earth who saw the Holy Spirit descending from heaven to earth and lighting upon him (John 1:32). This argument sets forth proof of my proposition because here on this one occasion, we are able to identify the three members of the Godhead. (1) The Father (one person) is speaking from heaven; (2) the Son (a second person), while praying, is coming forth from the waters of baptism; and, (3) the Holy Spirit (a third person) is descending in a bodily form. In later years the apostle Peter made reference to this event wherein he mentions the three members of the Godhead. He said, "How **God** anointed **Jesus** of Nazareth with the **Holy Spirit** and with power" (Acts 10:38). We agree with Peter.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #4

My next argument is taken from Genesis 1:26, which relates the plurality that was involved in the creation. Here the Bible reads: "And God said, Let us make man in **our** image, after **our** likeness." The reader should carefully note the first person plural pronouns that are here used in reference to God: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." The plurality here cannot refer to angels as is sometimes claimed for (1) angels are themselves created by God (Neh. 9:6; Psa. 148:2–5). They are not creators. (2) Man is made in God's image, not that of angels (Gen 9:6); and (3) the immediate context limits the creating to God (verse 27). Any implication that some other being had a hand in creation other than God is foreign to the Bible. The plurality here, likewise, cannot refer to humans, for as yet, none had been created for God to speak to. However, we know from other passages within the Bible that the conversation of Genesis 1:26 took place between the three persons of the Godhead.

(1) God the Father is said to have been the creator of all things. The apostles prayed, "Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is" (Acts 4:24; Cf. Mark 10:6; James 1:17). (2) But was there someone "with" the Father "in the beginning" that he could speak to who was instrumental in the creation? Hear the answer: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made ... And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (John 1:1–3, 14). Yes, the one afterward called "Jesus" who became flesh and dwelt among us is the one here spoken of who was "with" God "in the beginning" and was the Father's active agent in the work of creation. (3) Not only did the Father and the Son participate in the physical creation, but the second verse of the Bible mentions the Holy Spirit as also taking an active part in the creative work. "in the beginning God created ... and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (Gen. 1:1–2; Cf. Psa. 104:30; Job 26:13, 33:4).

Thus, we have the three members of the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, all involved in the creative work. The plurality of Genesis 1:26 would not and could not properly be used in reference to God if there were not a plural number that composes the Godhead.

A REMINDER

At times in debating the subject of the Godhead, an opponent may choose to introduce passages that state there is but one God. By doing this, he may think he is refuting the affirmative arguments set forth affirming that there are three personalities who comprise the one God. There will be no need for Mr. Lewis to introduce such passages from the Bible that state there is but one God and that God is one. If he introduces such passages, he is wasting his time because he is saying that which I already fully concur and believe. I have already pointed out that the term "God" is a name of the divine nature. Therefore, to say there is but one God is to say there is only one divine nature. I have proved from the above arguments that there are three persons who share this one divine nature. It will be Mr. Lewis' obligation to set forth arguments negating my arguments by showing that the one divine nature is not shared by three persons. But the reminder is this: he cannot prove my arguments false by simply crying "one God." We await his response.

MR. LEWIS' FIRST NEGATIVE

Mr. Wiggins, it is with pleasure that I enter into a written discussion with you on the subject of the Godhead. Too little, I fear, is in print on this subject, especially, the position our two fellowship groups hold. I assume that your position would represent the views of your brethren in the Church of Christ. I am sure that this study will not only help you and I, but it will also help others that may read this discussion. Also, I want to assure those who may read this discussion that there is nothing personal between Mr. Wiggins and Billy Lewis. We did not know of Mr. Wiggins until we received his challenge for this debate. Although we may speak plain so anyone can understand our positions, I am sure Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Lewis will be friends at the end of this discussion.

You pointed out to the readers how useless it would be for Mr. Lewis to introduce scripture that speak of one God, as that would only be stating what you already believed. We also wish to remind the readers that it was also a waste of time for Mr. Wiggins to introduce passages of scripture that show distinctions in the Godhead, because he was saying what we already believe. **THE ISSUE IS NOT OVER DISTINCTION IN THE GODHEAD.** We believe in the basic threeness of God. **THE ISSUE IS, "SEPARATE, DISTINCT PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD."** When you state that the **FATHER IS A PERSON**, and **THE SON IS A PERSON**, and **THE HOLY GHOST IS A PERSON**, you are saying what we already believe. That is, if it is lawful to call God a **PERSON**. The question is over whether the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three separate Persons, or three phases of only one **PERSON**.

As the Father, God loves, cares and, leads his children, etc. Through the Son, He brought redemption to mankind. As the Holy Ghost, He dwells in the church today. These are the three phases of God. All the readers should notice that none of the passages Mr. Wiggins cited speak of **"PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD."** The word "person" used in Hebrews 1:3 comes from the Greek word *HUPOSTASIS* (SUBSTANCE). According to W. E. Vine, it did not carry the meaning of the word **PERSON** until the fourth century A. D. The meaning of "*hupostasis*" is substance, nature, and essence. Therefore, Jesus was the express image of the Father's substance, etc. For instance, a photograph may express the image of Mr. Wiggins. Although there are some distinctions between Mr. Wiggins and his photograph, the person would be one and the same.

The reader should notice that Mr. Wiggins in some **places** has changed his wording from "persons of the Godhead: 'to "members in the Godhead." **PERSON** and **MEMBERS** are not the same. Personally, I feel it would be best to stay with the wording of the proposition.

ANSWER TO WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE

I agree that there is only one Divine Nature, meaning that there is only one God. Your position is that three separate and distinct persons share in this divine nature, and that each possesses the quality or nature of Deity. As I understand it, the Father is all Divine Nature. Extract Divine Nature from the Father and you will not have anything left. The same would also apply to the Holy Spirit. You will have to find separate persons, that is, separate and distinct from Divine Nature to have a point. In Jesus Christ, we have both the "Divine Nature" and "Human Nature." There are some distinctions in the two natures; however, the distinction is not that of persons. I am sure you do not think that the two natures in Jesus Christ are two persons in the Godhead. What is said of the Father could also be said of the Holy Spirit. For example, the Holy Spirit was also the Father of Jesus (Matthew 1:23). Your reasoning on the Godhead has two separate persons as the father of Jesus.

The phrase "God the Son" is not found in the scripture. You cited the passage of Hebrews 1:8, "But unto the Son he saith, thy throne O God, is for ever and ever." On the book of Hebrews, both F. F. Bruce and Ellingworth and Nida state there is an alternative rendering for "thy throne O God:" that is, "GOD IS THY THRONE." I have no problem with the King James translation when I look at the other side of the coin and see the dual nature of Jesus.

ANSWER TO ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO

The passage you cited in Ephesians 4:6–8 does not refer to separate persons in the Godhead. This passage does reveal some distinctions within the Godhead, but not persons in the Godhead. For example, there are some distinctions in the members of our bodies: the head, the foot, the arm, the leg, etc. As you well know, there is only one person in a body. It appears to me when you see the words Father, Jesus, and Holy Ghost that you think of persons in the Godhead when you should be thinking only of God.

The Ephesians were having trouble getting along and working together in unity. The Apostle reminded them that there was only one Spirit for the church. They did not have a choice to join another group or have another spirit. If your position is true concerning separate and distinct persons in the Godhead, then the Lord Jesus and the Father would not have an omnipresent spirit as there was only one spirit for the church. Could it be that the spirit of the Lord Jesus and the spirit of the Father is the same spirit as that of the Holy Ghost? If the Spirit of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is the same spirit, then you would need to find three separate and distinct persons that are separate and apart from the Spirit that each of your persons possesses. In other words, extract the Spirit from your persons in the Godhead and tell me what you have left.

It is true that the Spirit, Lord, and Father add up to the number three. Three what? Your Body, Soul, and Spirit also add up to the number three; however, your Body, Soul, and Spirit only make one person. Since you used addition of the Spirit, Lord, and Father to find your three persons in the Godhead, I will give you an example of what happens when you use addition for persons in the Godhead using Ephesians 4:4–6:

One person—The Spirit 1 God

One person—The Lord 1 God

One person—The Father 1 God

Total 3 Gods

Mr. Wiggins' reasoning of Ephesians 4:4–6 would make him believe in three Gods.

ANSWER TO ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE

At the baptism of Christ, I do not think the apostle John, or any other of the Apostles, got the idea of three separate persons in the Godhead. At the baptism of Christ, we see Jesus as man whom we assume is less than seven feet tall coming out of the water. At that time, John did not know who the Messiah would be, In John 1:33, John was told that he would see a visible sign. The sign was "upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he..." this was to prove to John that Jesus was the Messiah. You cannot see the Holy Ghost as no man has seen God at any time; therefore, God gave a visible sign, a dove coming down, and a

voice from heaven. Not three persons, but three manifestations of only one God. I hope you do not think that a bird or a voice is a person.

Please note the three gospels state that the heavens were opened." But what did John see? Did He see a person called the Father in heaven? NO!!! John did not see anything in heaven. The throne was vacant! The image that Ezekiel saw (Ezekiel 1:28) and Isaiah saw (Isaiah 6:1) had come down to earth and was made flesh (John 1:14; Colossians 1:16).

We must try to understand the omnipresence of God, and how God can speak from anywhere. The Jews considered a voice from heaven as something that could settle all controversy. God could have spoken from behind a tree on Jordan's bank; however, that would not have been as impressive. The voice and the dove were signs to John. They were not signs to prove three separate persons in the Godhead.

ANSWERS TO ARGUMENT NUMBER FOUR

A person would have to stretch his imagination to find three persons in Genesis 1:26. The Jews did not see three persons in the passage. In fact, the Hebrews used the plural for number and also to strengthen the idea of the word. If, using the plural form in Genesis 1:26 meant three persons in the Godhead, then each of us would be three persons. In Genesis 24:9–51, the word "MASTER" is plural and is used of Abraham. Is Abraham three persons? The word *Elohim* is plural and is used of Moses in Exodus 7:1. Is Moses three separate persons? The golden calf was referred to as *Elohim* in Exodus 32:4. Were there three separate and distinct golden calves? Daniel used the word "WE" referring to himself in Daniel when he said, "We will tell the interpretation thereof before the King" (Daniel 2:36). According to Mr. Wiggins' reasoning, Daniel would be three persons.

Revelation 5:6 speaks of seven spirits of God. Is God seven persons? Extract the spirit from your persons and tell me what you have left. Delitzsch, one of the foremost scholars on Genesis 1:26 says, "No other explanation is left therefore, than to regard this as a plural of majesty." The plural not only strengthens the idea behind the word, it brings all traits of Deity into the creation. *United Bible Societies, "Translator's Guide,"* by Herber F. Peacock states that the "plurals" used in this verse present certain problems of interpretation and translation. The plural may indicate that God is conferring with his heavenly court, that is, His angels, but since the word for God in Hebrew is a plural form, the plural pronoun forms may also mean that God is, so to speak, conferring with himself ... But some translations take the plurals as only referring to God and translate "I will make ... be like me and resemble me." They do not list persons in the Godhead as a possible translation for the plurals in Genesis 1:26.

In John 1:1, the word was "WITH" (*pros*) God and the word was God. The Greek word *PROS* is not the usual word used when one person is with another person. In fact, "*pros*" is "to or towards." It is also translated "pertaining to." In other words, the word "*Logos*" was the "wisdom, mind, and expression of God." God's expression was with Him, and pertained to Him, like a person's arm, leg, etc. would be a portion of himself.

In closing, I wish to remind our readers that words are vehicles of thoughts, and may carry different meanings for different people. When the word person is applied to the Godhead, it may be misleading. Not to say that any portion of God is impersonal, but persons refer to human beings, and it may not be the best word to use when we speak of the Godhead.

WIGGINS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #5

My fifth argument is taken from John 14:16. Here Jesus is conversing with his apostles in regard to the sending and their receiving the Holy Spirit. The Lord says, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." The reader should carefully note that Jesus here promises the apostles "another Comforter" This clearly implies that they already had one Comforter. The apostle John identifies Christ also as a Comforter in I John 2:1. There, the word "Advocate" translates the same Greek term (*paraklete*) as "Comforter" does in John 14:16. in view of the fact that Christ is called a *paraklete* I John 2:1, as is the Holy Spirit in John 14:16, it follows that there are here two distinct persons characterized by the term "Comforter." The fact that Christ is one and the Holy Spirit "another" evidences their distinction in person, though not in nature because the word "another" is translated from *allon* meaning "another of the same kind" and not *heteron* meaning "another of a different kind." Thus, from this passage the reader may clearly see the three persons who comprise the Godhead, all who, from this verse are said to have different functions. Christ the Son says, "I will pray the Father." So in this verse Christ says he will act the part of an intercessor. It is said of God the Father—"He shall give you another Comforter" Thus, the Father will act the part of a donator. And it is said of the Holy Spirit or the Comforter that he will "abide with you forever." Thus, the Holy Spirit would serve as a consolator and helper. All three (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) are said to serve different and distinct functions according to this passage. This relates directly to my proposition because here it is conclusive that there are three separate and distinct persons within the Godhead.

PERSON.

Mr. Lewis is agreeable to the definitions I gave to the wording of my proposition with the exception of his half-hearted objection to my using the word "persons" in reference to the three who comprise the Godhead. He thinks that when the word "person" is applied to the Godhead, it may be misleading. He wonders "if it is lawful to call God a PERSON." It seems he wants to say that the word person should only be used in reference to "human beings" and not the Godhead. But then watch this amazing sentence that Mr. Lewis writes within his third paragraph. I quote: "When you state that the Father is a person, and the Son is a person, and the Holy Ghost is a person, you are saying what we already believe." No, Mr. Lewis, you do not know what you believe. You object to my using the word "person" in regard to the Godhead and then you turn right around and use it yourself! Mr. Lewis thinks he is guided by the Holy Spirit in his teaching. Did the Holy Spirit guide you to use a term in reference to the Godhead which is not "lawful," Mr. Lewis? When you debated David Lipe in Memphis some years ago, you affirmed that the "Godhead is comprised of one person." Did the Holy Spirit guide you into error by using the word "person" in reference to the Godhead then? The fact is that I defined the term "person" in my proposition with the exact same terminology that Lewis used in his debate with Lipe. Mr. Lewis did not know I did this and so he makes his first blunder by refuting his own "Holy Spirit-guided" definition. Really, this whole objection by my opponent was nothing but a quibble used to take up space and he gains nothing by it.

POINT OF ISSUE.

Another objection that Mr. Lewis makes is in regard to the point of doctrinal difference between us in this debate. I clearly stated in the first sentence following the definitions of my proposition

that "the point of doctrinal difference between Mr. Lewis and myself in this debate is the **number** of members who comprise the Godhead." I went on to say that "I believe that the Bible teaches that God (or the Godhead) is composed of **three** distinct members" while my opponent "believes that God (or the Godhead) is composed of only **one** being." The reader may clearly see from these quotations that I took plenty of effort to point *out* that the center of opposition in this debate is over the number of persons within the Godhead. And then Mr. Lewis comes along and says, "the issue is not over distinctions in the Godhead." No, the debate is not over merely distinctions in the Godhead, and I never said it was. The debate is over both number and distinction as is expressly stated in my proposition. Because there is a plurality that composes the Godhead, then it follows there are distinctions in the Godhead. This was nothing but another side-line quibble which helps him in no way. If he had read my comments more carefully, he would have known that I had already so clarified the point of issue between us in this debate as to be understood by all.

DEFENSE OF MY ARGUMENTS:

ARGUMENT #1

This argument consisted of setting forth proof that all three (the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) are referred to as "God" in the Bible (John. 6:27; Heb. 1:8; Acts 5:3–4). And that even though there is but one God (i.e., one divine nature), these three are all referred to as God because all three possess the divine nature—the characteristics of deity. There is but one divine nature, but there are **three** possessing this unified set of qualities. Mr. Lewis really could not and did not disagree with this argument, as I knew he would not. He did say that the phrase "God the Son" is not found in the Bible. Correct, but neither does "God the Holy Spirit" occur in the Bible, but the Spirit possesses the characteristics of deity and may be properly referred to as God. I pointed out from Heb. 1:8 that the Son is called God. Mr. Lewis says he has no problem with this translation. Neither do I, for here the Son is referred to as God; and you lose your point. He further says that my reasoning on the Godhead makes Jesus have two Fathers. Not so. Not once is the Holy Spirit called the "Father" of Jesus in the Bible. The Holy Spirit was only an agent of the Father in the conception. This was a miracle with no sexual relationship at all. If I empower another person to do something for me, I actually and legally do it even though through the instrumentality of another. In this way, the Holy Spirit was the agent of the Father. Mr. Lewis' ridiculous position has Jesus being begotten of himself and is his own Father!

ARGUMENT#2

In this argument, I proved from Eph. 4:4–6 that the seven items of which Paul says in each case there is **one**, included those of the Godhead. The emphasis of this argument is not only that there are three in the Godhead; but that they are three; and they are not the same. The Father, Lord, and Spirit of this passage are distinct as is the body, the hope, the faith, and the baptism. Mr. Lewis conveniently overlooked this part of the argument. He further fails to realize that I had already proved from my argument #1 that there is only one God; but that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all God, because they all possess the attributes of deity. Thus, there is only **one** God; but **three** who compose the one God. So down goes Mr. Lewis' assertion *that my chart leads to the conclusion of three "Gods,"*

ARGUMENT #3

Mr. Lewis shows his utter inability to thwart the truth by his feeble and desperate attempts to answer this argument, Here I pointed out that three persons of the Godhead are here easily noted by their simultaneous actions on this one occasion. The Son is being baptized in the Jordan. The Holy Spirit is descending from heaven to earth. And the Father is speaking from heaven. From this I emphasized that the Son is not the Father; for the Father is the one who spoke from heaven (Matt. 3:17), **while** Jesus was praying (Lk. 3:22–23). But neither is the Holy Spirit the Father or the Son for the Holy Spirit was descending **while** the Father was in heaven speaking, and **while** the Son was on earth praying! Neither did Mr. Lewis say even one word about what Peter says of this occasion: "How **God** anointed **Jesus** of Nazareth with the **Holy Spirit** and power." He thinks these were just "manifestations" or "phases" of deity. My opponent says, "I hope you don't think that a bird, or a voice is a person." No, I know a bird or a voice is not a person. But I do know that the voice came from a person for Peter said it was "God the Father" (2 Pet. 1:17–18). I also know that it was another person, Christ, who was coming out of the Baptismal waters at the very moment the voice came from the Father. and at the very moment the Holy Spirit descended. Mr. Lewis has one phase or manifestation speaking, praying, and descending with two other phases. Pshaw!

ARGUMENT #4

My next argument was based on the plurality of the Godhead in the creative work. "And **God** said, let **us** make man in **our** image, after **our** likeness" (Gen. 1:26). I then conclusively showed that all three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, were all "in the beginning" and took an active part in the physical creation. Lewis thinks he has answered the argument by giving an alternate suggestion that it was probably the angels God was talking to. However, I had included in this argument three reasons why it could not be angels that were here conversed with, to which Mr. Lewis did not even acknowledge as being a part of my argument. He further makes a play on the term "with" in John 1:1 and hilariously tries to get the reader to believe that Christ was only an extension of the Father such as an arm or leg would be to a person's physical body.

But hear Paul: "For by him (Christ) were all things created ... all things were created by him (Christ), and for him (Christ), and he (Christ) is before all things, and by him (Christ) all things consist" (Col. 1:16–17). No, Mr. Lewis, it was Jesus Christ who was "with" God in the beginning and later "became flesh and dwelt among us" (John 1:1–14). Mr. Lewis never did mention whether or not he thought the Holy Spirit was a foot or a hand like the Christ was a leg. This argument stands. Try again.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #6

My sixth argument is based on I Tim. 2:5: "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Here it is said that Jesus Christ is the "mediator" between God and man. The term mediator translates the Greek, *mesites* (from *mesos*, "middle" and *eimi*, "to go") and so literally, a go between. Arndt and Gingrich note that the term is used of "one who mediates between two parties to remove a disagreement or reach a common goal. Of Christ with the genitive of persons between whom he mediates..." (*Greek Lexicon*, p. 508). It is obvious to all that Christ could not be a mediator BETWEEN God and man if only one person or being makes up the totality of the Godhead.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #7

"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13:32). While Jesus was upon earth, he did not know the time of his second coming. The Father knew but the Son did not, thus clearly showing that the Father and the Son are two distinct persons. Similarly, and whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven Him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (Matt. 12:32). From this passage it is also certain that Christ and the Holy Spirit are not identical in personality. But neither is the Holy Spirit and the Father the same. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John. 14:26). Here it is said that the Father would send the Holy Spirit upon the apostles. Thus, from these verses it is clear that the Holy Spirit is not the same as the Father or the Son. But neither is the Son the same as the Father or the Holy Spirit. And neither is the Father the same as the Son or the Holy Spirit. Yet all three are called God in the Bible because they possess the divine nature. I am confident that this argument sustains my proposition and relates directly to the number and distinction of those who make up the Godhead.

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT #8

My next argument consists of a use of those scriptures that mention those within the Godhead in the same passage. This will allow the reader to see, without comment, how the Bible writers listed the members of the Godhead. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the **Father**, and of the **Son**, and of the **Holy Ghost**" (Matt. 28:19). "The grace of the **Lord Jesus Christ**, and the love of **God**, and the communion of the **Holy Ghost**, be with you all. Amen" (2 Cor. 13:14). "Elect according to the foreknowledge of **God the Father**, through sanctification of the **Spirit**, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of **Jesus Christ**" (1 Pet. 1:2). "...Praying in the **Holy Ghost**, Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our **Lord Jesus Christ** unto eternal life" (Jude 20–21). "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same **Spirit**. And there are differences of administrations, but the same **Lord**. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same **God** which worketh all in all" (1 Cor. 12:4–6). No one in Bible times ever thought of "phases" or "manifestations" when reading these passages. But rather conscious and rational beings that can and do act—persons—the three who comprise the Godhead.

LEWIS' SECOND NEGATIVE

ANSWER TO WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER FIVE

The reader can understand the distinctions (not persons) in the Godhead if they can understand that Jesus was a man, and that Jesus was God. The unique being of Jesus Christ consists of two natures, "HUMAN" and "DIVINE." The HUMAN NATURE communicated with the DIVINE NATURE in Jesus.

John 14:16 gives us a good example of the HUMAN and DIVINE NATURES. Jesus said, "I will pray the Father and He will give you another comforter..." When Jesus said, "I WILL PRAY," it shows the HUMAN NATURE praying to the DIVINE NATURE. ACCORDING TO MR. WIGGINS, THIS VERSE SHOWS ONE PERSON IN THE GODHEAD PRAYING TO ANOTHER, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT, PERSON IN THE GODHEAD. Mr. Wiggins, when Jesus prayed, was he praying as God, or praying as man? Is God praying to God? How can one God pray to another God without undeifying the God that is praying? The one who prays is always less than God! Jesus praying only shows his HUMAN and DIVINE NATURES, not PERSONS in the GODHEAD. John 14:16 also says of the Father, "THAT HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER COMFORTER..." Mr. Wiggins thinks one separate distinct person in the Godhead is praying to another separate distinct person in the Godhead about sending a third separate distinct person in the Godhead. What did Jesus mean by another comforter? What would the other comforter be? John 14:17 says it was the SPIRIT OF TRUTH. Who was the SPIRIT OF TRUTH? Verse 6 says the truth was Jesus. Therefore, the Spirit of Jesus would be the Spirit of Truth. Verse 17 says "for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." Verse 18 shows that the comforter would be Jesus. "I WILL NOT LEAVE YOU COMFORTLESS, I WILL COME TO YOU." "Another" refers to another way that he was going to comfort them. He was with them in bodily presence before he went away; He would return to dwell in them in another way. This was by His spirit dwelling in them. Another may mean "differentiated in quality or behavior though the same in substance and identity."

In I Samuel 10:6, "Saul became another man." I am sure no one thinks that Saul became another person. According to Mr. Wiggins, we have two separate and distinct comforters. He has ONE PERSON, the HOLY GHOST, as the *parakletos* (comforter), and another person, Christ, as the *parakletos* (comforter). Please tell the readers how they can tell which of the comforters (THE HOLY GHOST, or CHRIST) is bringing them comfort? Sorry, Mr. Wiggins, you cannot find persons in the Godhead in John 14:16, or anywhere else.

No, Mr. Wiggins, I am not half-hearted in objecting to the use of the word "persons" in describing the Godhead. I totally disagree with you. You are a good example as to how a person can be misled when using the word "persons" to describe the Godhead. The reason I said that it may not be lawful was because the term persons was never used to describe the Godhead in the Bible. To my knowledge, I have never used the word "Persons" to describe the Godhead. I have no problem with the word "person" in the singular because Christ was made like unto his brethren in all things (Hebrews 2:17). Therefore, we have to explain how Jesus Christ was a person so that people will not be misled. Webster says a person is "an individual human being consisting of body and soul, a man, woman, or child." Since we generally, if not always, use the word person for human beings, it may be misleading to use the term when referring to higher beings than man or lower beings than man. Since Mr. Wiggins agrees that there is only one divine nature, then we have to agree that the divine nature of the Father, the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and the divine nature of the Holy Ghost is all the same divine nature. The Father is

all divine nature, the Holy Ghost is all divine nature. Jesus Christ has two natures—human and divine. We ask you again to extract divine nature from your persons in the Godhead, and show the readers your persons apart from divine nature. You overlooked this point in your last reply, and I prophesy that you will overlook it again.

To set Mr. Wiggins straight, Billy Lewis has never claimed that he was guided by the Holy Spirit in his teaching. His slurs about inspiration have nothing to do with our discussion of the Godhead. Perhaps we can debate the Holy Spirit baptism at a later date.

We pointed out to the readers where Mr. Wiggins was changing the word "persons" to the word "members." Again, the debate is not over members, distinctions in the Godhead, or plurality in the Godhead. Numbers, members, or distinctions, does not mean that God is made up of three persons. Mr. Wiggins' quibble is only a smoke screen to hide the issue. Mr. Wiggins knew he was cornered so he used other terms to try to make it look like he had a point. I do not blame him for not liking the term persons in the Godhead. He knows that it can be misleading.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE

I agree that the Holy Spirit and the Father are God. The Father and the Spirit are of the same substance or nature. However, the Son refers to that which was born (THE HUMAN NATURE), therefore, the Son is not God. The Son that was born (human nature) was fused together with the same divine nature as that of the Father and Spirit. Therefore, Jesus Christ was both God and man. Do you think that Jesus as God is one person and Jesus as man is another person? Did you ever see a son as old as his father? Mr. Wiggins has the divine nature plus three separate distinct persons in the Godhead that possess the divine nature. Again, please extract divine nature from your persons, and explain how your persons in the Godhead are separate from the one divine nature that they possess. I say you cannot do it. Again, Hebrews 1:8 could have been translated "Thy throne is God, or, God is thy throne." See *A Translator's Handbook* by Ellingworth and Nida; and *A Textual Commentary* by Bruce Metzger. A person will have no problem with this verse (Hebrews 1:8) if they understand that Jesus is both "Human" and "Divine."

WHO IS THE FATHER OF JESUS?

Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost, Mathew 1:23. "For that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." Mr. Wiggins says that the HOLY SPIRIT (the third person in the Godhead) was working as an agent for the FATHER (the first person in the Godhead).

Mr. Wiggins, common sense will tell you that the one who plants the seed in the woman's womb would be the father of the child. I do not think any man would claim a child having another person working as an agent for him. I would not claim a child with someone serving as my agent, would you? True, it was a miracle! If, however, the Father and the Holy Spirit are not the same divine being, you have Jesus with two Fathers. No, Mr. Wiggins, we do not believe that Jesus was his own father. The one DIVINE NATURE was the father of the son (human nature) that was born of Mary. On the side of the divine nature, Jesus was one and the same with the Father. On the side of his mother, he took on human nature. Therefore, Jesus as God was the Father of Jesus as man. The two natures, "human and divine," were fused together in the incarnation.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO

Yes, one is mentioned seven times in Ephesians 4:4–6. However, if you make the Father, Lord, and Spirit three separate and distinct persons, you are adding to the passage. Your reasoning for three separate persons makes three Gods (regardless of what you say). For instance, take the one spirit. Is not the one Spirit the same Spirit as that of the Father? Jesus also is Spirit as well as man. Jesus as man could only be at one place at a time. As Spirit, however, he said that anywhere two or three were gathered in his Name, he would be in the midst of them (Matthew 18:20). Also, we are to worship the Father in Spirit (John 3:23). If the Spirit of the Father, and the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of Jesus are not the same Spirit, then you have three separate Spirits in the Godhead. Again, you need to explain your persons apart from the spirit. Maybe you need to give this passage another twist.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE,

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS (LUKE 3:22–23)

We must remember that God is a single, unique being and can speak from any place at any time. God can appear at different places at the same time and still be the same God. The voice from heaven and the dove descending were of the same divine nature, not different persons in the Godhead. Jesus, as man standing in the water, was distinct from DIVINE NATURE. However, the Father said, "Thou art my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," It pleased the Divine Nature to be in the human nature. The voice from heaven and the dove descending were demonstrations of the same divine nature (not persons) and was a confirmation to John that Jesus was the Messiah. Yes, God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and power. Jesus of Nazareth refers to the human nature that was born of Mary. The divine nature anointed the human nature of Jesus with power. This I have no problem with. It's strange that you have to insert persons in the Bible to get your teaching.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER FOUR

(Genesis 1:26) According to Mr. Wiggins, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost were all active in the creation. As a result of this thinking, Mr. Wiggins has a son before the son was born. Is the Son as old as his Father? If so, who was his Father back there? I have never seen a son as old as his father. Mr. Wiggins, the word "Son" denotes birth. A beginning. "Thou art my son, today have I begotten thee" (Hebrews 5:5). You can't be begotten and eternal at the same time. If you think so, please explain. You don't have to prove that Jesus was in the beginning. We know that he existed in the beginning as the "Word" (Logos), and all things were made by him (John 1:1–3). All things were made by the Word (Logos), not the Son. As a Son, He (Jesus) could do nothing of himself (John 5:19).

It was the WORD (LOGOS) that was made flesh (John 1:14). The Logos became a Son through the incarnation. On Genesis 1:26, I listed the two possible interpretations that the scholars gave on the verse. *The Translator's Handbook* did not list Mr. Wiggins' interpretation of the plurals. The two interpretations given were: (1) God was conferring with His heavenly court—that is, His angels. (2) God was, so to speak, conferring with Himself. Personally, I feel that God was conferring with Himself. Ephesians 1:11 states, "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." All things would also include creation.

I believe that all traits of the one divine nature were active in the creation.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER SIX

(I Timothy 2:5) "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man..." The mediatorship has a definite reference to the human nature of Jesus Christ. The human nature of Jesus was a mediator between us and the divine nature. On I Timothy 2:5, *A Translator's Guide* by Robert Bratcher, page 22, states the mediator means "one who leads one to God, one who makes it possible for everyone to be saved by God, one who reunites humanity to God, the Man Christ Jesus: Christ's humanity is affirmed." Jesus had the nature of humanity; he also had the nature of God.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER SEVEN

(Mark 13:32) Mr. Wiggins has one person in the Godhead keeping secrets from another person in the Godhead. Mr. Wiggins' reasoning makes Jesus less than omniscient (knowing everything). Jesus had limitations only in his human nature (sonship). It was as a son (man) that he didn't know when he was coming. The Son refers to the human nature and not to another person in the Godhead. If the Son is God, you have a God that increased in wisdom, a God that could do nothing, a God that learned, a God that prayed, a God that didn't know when he was coming.

WIGGINS' ARGUMENT NUMBER EIGHT

Mr. Wiggins' list of scripture with more than one name has nothing to do with persons in the Godhead. The Hebrew mind had a tendency for repetition of synonymous elements, (see Gleason Archer in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*.) Keil–Delitzsch says, "The threefold repetition of a word or sentence serves to express the thought as strong as possible." We can look at the New Testament and find a number of synonymous lists. In Ephesians 1:1, the saints at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ are the same people. 2 Thessalonians 1:9, "The presence of the Lord and the glory of His power." PRESENCE and GLORY are not two persons. In Luke 1:35, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee." The "power of the highest" and the Holy Ghost are the same. The two natures of Jesus explain Mr. Wiggins' arguments.

LEWIS' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

RESOLVED: THE SCRIPTURE TEACHES THAT THE GODHEAD CONSISTS OF ONLY ONE DIVINE BEING

By the **scripture**, we mean the 66 books of the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments. By **teach** we mean to instruct, to enlighten, to impart knowledge. By the term **Godhead**, we mean divinity, deity, divine nature or divine substance. By **consist** of, we mean composed of, made up of, summed up in. By **one**, we mean a numerical one, a single, only one as opposed to three beings in a unified one. By the term **being**, we mean a living one, a self-existent one. The issue is not over whether or not there are some distinctions within this one divine being; but the issue is whether or not the Father, the Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost are three separate and distinct persons or beings in the Godhead, or three phases of the same (Greek, *hupostasis*) substance or being. The reader should notice when we speak of the *hupostasis* of God, we are referring to the divine nature or substance.

ARGUMENT ONE

The Godhead (*theiotes*) according to Arndt and Gingrich's Lexicon, page 359, means "deity or Divinity." This one deity is a single unique being. In the Old Testament scripture, this one deity or divine substance was known by many names; however, in the New Testament, he is known mostly by the name of the Father, the Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost. This one deity only has one *hupostasis* (nature, substance).

So, the *hupostasis* of the Father, Christ, and Holy Ghost is the same *hupostasis*. There is only one *hupostasis* in the Godhead and is summed up in one being. Hebrews 1:3, He (Jesus) is the (Greek, *charakter*) "express image" of the Father's *hupostasis* (person). According to Thayer's Lexicon, page 665, the Greek word "*charakter*" means "the exact expression of any person or thing." Arndt and Gingrich Lexicon, page 884, states *charakter* means Christ is "an exact representation of His (God's) nature."

Therefore, if Christ is the exact representation or exact expression of God's nature, all we have to do is look at Jesus to see how many beings we have in the Godhead.

A modern day example would be the photograph. A photograph will express exactly what it sees, so if you take a picture of three persons, the same three persons will be expressed in the photograph. If divine substance is made up of three persons, tell the readers why the photography of divine substance showed only one person. If Mr. Wiggins' reasoning of three persons in the Godhead is true, Mary should have given birth to triplets that would be an exact expressing of Mr. Wiggins' three person Godhead. However, the Bible expression of divine substance shows only one being.

ARGUMENT TWO

Jesus said, "The first of all the commandments is, hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord," Mark 12:29. The scribe said in Mark 12:32 Master, thou has said the truth; for there is one God and there is none other but he." The Greek text states, "One is God and there is none other but him." One in this passage comes from the Greek word *heis*. Arndt and Gingrich Lexicon shows *heis* means, "a single, only one." So, the one refers to a single being, as opposed to three beings. The one in Mark 12:32 is a masculine one. According to A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures*,

volume 5, page 186, when one is masculine, it refers to one person. Also, if there is more than one person in the Godhead, Jesus missed a good opportunity to correct the scribe, Instead of correcting the scribe, Jesus said to the Scribe , " ...thou art not far from the kingdom of God..."

THE IMAGE OF GOD

Generally the divine substance of God is unseeable; however, God is able to change a portion of himself into an image that can be seen, Speaking of Christ, the scripture says, "Who is the image of the invisible God," Colossians 1:15. Before the incarnation, God had a form or image, Philippians 2:6. It was in this form that God appeared to some men in the Old Testament. Genesis 32:24–30, "...and these wrestled a man with him (Jacob) and Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face..." Numbers 14:14, "...thou, Lord art seen face to face..." Samson's parents said, "We shall surely die because we have seen God..... Judges 13:17–22. 1 Kings 22:19, "...I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne,,, " God, in general, is a spirit (John 4:24) and cannot be seen by men. John 1:18, "Whom no man hath seen nor can see..." God cannot be seen as a total being; however, he changed a portion of himself (the Word [*logos*] John 1:1) into an image that could be seen. Later Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," John 14:9. "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," Colossians 2:9. Jesus is "the image of the invisible God," Colossians 1:15. He (Jesus) is the express image of his Father's person (substance), Hebrews 1:3.

We must remember that God as a total being cannot be seen. However, a portion of a person can be spoken of as if it were a whole. For instance, in John 14:8, when Philip saw Jesus, did he see all of the Father? No! As a total being, God still filled the heaven of heavens. Philip only saw the image of God that was made flesh, John 1:14. Outside that image he still filled the heavens. An example of this would be: I saw Jim in a crowd downtown. However, I may have seen only his head and shoulders. There was a lot of Jim that I did not see. Did I see Jim? Yes! Did I see all of Jim? No! The truth is, I only saw a portion of Jim. The portion of Jim that I saw and the portion I did not see would all be the same thing.

ARGUMENT THREE – JESUS IS GOD

Jesus said, "Except you believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins", John 8:24. "They understood not that he spake to them of the Father," John 8:27. "I and my Father are one," John 10:30. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," John 14:9. John 14:10, "the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," Colossians 2:9. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made," John 1:3. Colossians 1:16, "...all things were created by him, and for him." Although there is much more scripture to prove that Jesus is God, the scripture listed should be sufficient. The reader must remember the portion of God that can be seen in Jesus is the same God as the invisible portion that cannot be seen outside his body.

ARGUMENT FOUR – JESUS AS THE SON

"Therefore that Holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1:35. This verse plainly tells us why Jesus was the Son of God. THE SON WAS BORN. Common sense will tell you that a son cannot be as old as his father. Jesus as God is of the same substance as any other portion of God. He, Jesus the Word, the Logos of God, became a son only when he was born of Mary. The Father is the divine substance, which was not incarnated as

contrasted to the visible image of God that was incarnated. The divine substance in the body of Christ is one and the same with divine (substance) everywhere.

JESUS AS A SON

1. Increased in wisdom, Luke 2:52
2. Can do nothing of himself, John 5:19
3. Had to be taught, John 8:28
4. He learned, Hebrews 5:8
5. Did not know when he was coming, Mark 13:32
6. Was tempted in all points as we are, Hebrews 2:18 None of the terms listed would apply to the divine substance.

We must remember that Jesus had both a divine and human substance, thus he had a human consciousness distinct from God. The human consciousness could commune with the divine nature as well as any other man. If not, Jesus would not have been a complete man. Jesus was complete God on his father's side and complete man on his mother's side, The two natures fused together in one single being, namely, Jesus Christ our Lord. An example, the iceberg is in the water, and water is in the iceberg. The iceberg is a solid form of the same substance as water. The body of Jesus would be the iceberg, the solid form or image of God, and the Father would be the water. Thus, you have God in Jesus, and Jesus in God as one being. It would be hard to find an expression that would adequately describe the incarnation, because nothing like this had happened before in the human race. Therefore, such an event is beyond that of human experience. There are some things about the incarnation we may never understand.

In biology, we are told that what we are in birth is determined by genes, which are located on little bands called chromosomes.

Each human birth gets a set of chromosomes from his father and a set from his mother, There is no indication that it was different in the birth of Jesus. The single cell that encased these chromosomes had been the image of God, the Word, by which God ruled the world. The WORD was condensed into a single cell, this cell (the smallest unit of life) united with another cell in the womb of Mary, and the Son of God was conceived, begotten, and later was born. The total being of Jesus is a mixture of human and divine in one body. So the divine substance in heaven and the divine substance on earth is the same being whether in or out of the body of Christ. If Mr. Wiggins' argument about three separate and distinct persons in the Godhead is true, then all three persons would reside in Christ. Jesus said, "The Father dwells in me," John 14:12. "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost," Luke 4:1. The first person, the Father, dwelled in the second person, the Son. The second person was also full of the third person, the Holy Spirit. According to Mr. Wiggins, three separate and distinct persons would have to be in the body of Christ.

ARGUMENT FIVE—THE HOLY SPIRIT IS GOD

Peter said, "Ananias, why has Satan filled thine heart to lie *to* the Holy Ghost ... thou has not lied unto men but unto God," Acts 5:3–4. Peter believed that the Holy Spirit was God. The Bible

states the Holy Ghost "spake" (Acts 13:2) and the Holy Ghost came upon them, Acts 19:6. When the Bible speaks of the Holy Ghost doing any act or deed, what does it prove? It proves the Holy Ghost is a divine being. There is not one passage of scripture that shows the Holy Spirit is a separate being from that of the Father and the Word. If there were separate distinct persons *in* the Godhead, we would have a confusion of powers! God is said to have created, Genesis 1:1. Christ is said to create, Hebrews 1:10. Also the Holy Ghost is said to create, Psalms 104:30. Did not one God create us all? If so, the *hupostasis*, substance of the Father, Christ, and the Holy Ghost would be the same *hupostasis*, substance or being. One person may have many roles to fill, for instance, I am a father, I am a son, and I am also a husband. My vocabulary may vary for each role I fill. When I change from father to son, I do not become another person, nor do I cease to be a person because I go from one role to another. All three roles are filled by the same being. A person may hold many positions and still be the same being.

If I understand Mr. Wiggins correctly, he has three separate distinct persons in the Godhead, one person for the Father, another person for the Son, and another person for the Holy Spirit. For Mr. Wiggins to have a point, he will have to prove that each of his persons has his own *hupostasis*. As I understand it, all deity is of the same *hupostasis*; therefore, the divine *hupostasis* of all three would be the same being. Please find me three persons apart from the one divine (*hupostasis*) substance and you will have your point.

During all of our discussions, you have ignored this question. It would be helpful if you would tell the readers whether or not you teach that each of your three separate and distinct persons in the Godhead has his own separate and distinct *hupostasis*. If so, please explain the *hupostasis* of each of your persons in the Godhead. You need to address this point as we have only one more reply. We will be waiting for your reply,

WIGGINS' FIRST NEGATIVE

The roles and responsibilities of Mr., Lewis and myself are now reversed. He is now in the affirmative and the burden of proof rests upon him. He has attempted to fulfill this responsibility with five arguments in his first affirmative speech. It is now my duty, as the negative respondent, to reply to and refute Mr. Lewis' arguments. I intend to do that very thing. In fact, I do not intend for even one verse or one statement of any significance to go unnoticed while I am in the negative position. I know that Mr. Lewis is teaching a doctrine that is not in harmony with the Bible. His beliefs on the Godhead are false and it is really a picnic for me to expose his errors. I now begin.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT ONE

Mr. Lewis is correct in stating that the *hupostasis* of Hebrews 1:3 refers to the divine nature, the substance or essence of God. He is also correct in stating that there is but one *hupostasis*, divine nature, deity, or God. He is wrong, however, in stating that this divine nature or substance is shared by only one person or being. Hebrews 1:3 says that Christ is the "express image" of the Father's *hupostasis*, or substance. Lewis draws the conclusion from this passage that since the Son is the exact representation or expression of God's nature, and since Christ is but one individual, then there must be only one being which composes the Godhead. He further attempts to buttress his argument by using an illustration from photography. Lewis argues that since a photograph taken of three persons shows three individuals, then Mary should have given birth to triplets to express the three persons in the Godhead.

His argument is easily answered. First, the statement that God's Son is the "express image" of the Father's substance is simply a declaration of Christ's deity and has not anything to do whatsoever with the number of personalities in the Godhead. This is a reference to the divine nature of Christ. The Hebrew writer, in demonstrating the superiority and finality of Christianity, begins by showing the superiority of the Son as God's prophet or spokesman. The writer establishes this by giving seven credentials of the Son through whom God has spoken to us in these last days (see Hebrews 1:2–3). The fourth credential is that Christ is the "express image" of the Father's substance, essence, or nature. The Hebrew writer is emphasizing by this that; not only the message of God, but also the very nature or essence of God is also revealed to us in the Son. Christ is the revelation of God's nature. Jesus, the Son, is of the same substance (deity) that God, the Father, is of.

Mr. Lewis, it is to your disadvantage that you have even used Hebrews 1:3 because this passage not only affirms the deity of the Son but also that he is a separate being than the Father. Though their nature is one and the same, this verse shows that they also retain individual identity. For, the seventh credential of the Son that the Hebrew writer lists is that he "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (1:3). The Son ascended back into heaven, back to the Father, and sat down on the right hand of the Father. Mr. Lewis, did Christ ascend back to himself and sit down on his own right hand? And also on the word "image" (*charakter*), W. E. Vine observes: "In the NT it is used metaphorically in Heb. 1:3, of the Son of God as 'the very image (marg.—the impress) of his substance,' RV. The phrase expresses the fact that the Son 'is both personally distinct from, and yet literally equal to him of whose essence he is the adequate imprint'" (*Expository Dictionary of the New Testament, II*, page 247).

Vine is correct in saying the Son is both "personally distinct from" the Father, but yet "equal" with the Father because both possess the same divine nature or substance. Yet the Son ascended

to the Father and sat down at the Father's right hand, according to the same verse Vine comments on. This demonstrates two members of the Godhead. Thus, I have now taken Lewis' argument from him and taught the truth from the very passage he thought was his. We bid him to try again.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT TWO

Here Lewis quotes Mark 12:29, "The Lord our God is one Lord." From this he concludes that there is but one being which composes the Godhead. My friend thinks the masculine "one" has reference to the one person of the Godhead as opposed to three. But really this verse is nothing more than an affirmation that there is but one God, one divine nature, or one deity. As I stated from the very beginning of the debate, I believe there is but one God. In Mark 12:29–30, Jesus is quoting Deuteronomy 6:4–5 which, taken in the context of the book and specifically chapter six, was merely a warning to the Israelites that there is but one God and that they were not to "go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are around you" (Duet. 6:14). The term "God" is simply a name of the divine nature. Therefore, for Jesus to say there is but one God is to say there is only one divine nature. In my very first affirmative, I reminded Mr. Lewis that there would be no need for him to introduce such passages that state there is but one God and that God is one. I pointed out to him that when he introduces such passages, he is wasting his time because he is saying that which I already believe and accept. Despite my good intentions to help Mr. Lewis, "He went and done it anyway!"

LEWIS' ARGUMENT THREE

Mr. Lewis entitles this argument "Jesus is God." Yes, but when the scriptures affirm that "Jesus is God," they are merely teaching that Jesus is divine, that he is deity, just as the Father and the Holy Spirit are also God because they too possess the divine nature. My friend thinks when the Bible says "Jesus is God" that this means Jesus is the Son, the Father, and the Holy Spirit, and that he simply manifests himself by these three different "phases." Now you know why this doctrine is called the "Jesus Only" doctrine. Mr. Lewis then lists several passages attempting to prove that Jesus and the Father are the same identity. Now watch me make reply to each and every passage and turn his arguments against him. John 10:30, "I and my Father are one." Yes, Jesus and the Father are "one" in doctrine, unity, aim, and purpose. Thus, there is certainly a sense in which Jesus and his father are one. But until my opponent proves that Jesus here taught that he and the Father are "one person," he gains nothing by this verse. Jesus prayed in John 17:20–23 that his followers might be one "even as" the Father and he were one. Mr. Lewis, are your brethren one, "even as" the Father and the Son are one? If so, according to your position, they must be one big fat person!

John 14:9, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Mr. Lewis wants us to think that the Father and Son are the same identity of person. But to any reader of John's Gospel, the apostle has already made it clear that to see Jesus was to see the Father, not actually, but representatively. John states that Jesus "declared" the Father, revealed him, and made him known to man (see John 1:18). Thus, a proper apprehension of the Son would have enabled the disciples to know the Father also. To know one was to know the other. It was this which prompted the Lord to say to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," because the Father was revealed in him. Mr. Lewis has Jesus "declaring" himself and Jesus as his own Father!

Colossians 2:9, "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." It is characteristic of Mr. Lewis to take passages designed to teach the deity of Christ and then conclude, because Jesus is divine, that he must be the only person in the Godhead. His attempt on Colossians 2:9 is

a good example, Not only so, but my friend also demonstrates his complete ignorance of what is *being taught* from the context of Colossians chapter two. Anyone who has ever studied this chapter knows that the apostle is here contrasting the fullness that is in Christ with the emptiness and vanity of the heathen systems and philosophies popular at that time. Paul penned these words to warn the Christians against accepting any of these current false philosophies assuring them that in Christ all the attributes of the divine nature dwelled and that "in him" they were made "complete" and stood in need of nothing from the heathen systems or even Judaism (see Col. 2:8–19), Mr. Lewis, 1:19 says that it "pleased the Father" for all the fullness to dwell in the Son. Who was pleased, the Father or the Son? Here are at least two persons in the Godhead and once again, I have taken your own passages and taken your point from you.

John 8:24, "Except you believe that I am he, you shall die in your sins." And then verse 27, "They understood not that he spake to them of the Father." Mr. Lewis connects these two verses together in an effort to make the Father and the Son the same "he" of verse 24. But really, verse 27, which States that the Jews did not understand that Jesus "spake to them of the Father," has direct reference to the immediate preceding verse 26 and not to verse 24. Here, in verse 26, Jesus says, "He that sent me is true:" and "those things which I have heard of him," Jesus said someone sent him! Who sent Jesus into the world Mr. Lewis? According to verse 29, it was the Father (one person) who sent the Son (a second person). Mr. Lewis is like the Jews of this passage because he does not know the Father sent another person into the world, his Son. Lewis thinks the Son sent himself! His reference to John 1:3 and Colossians 1:16 which teach that Jesus was instrumental in the creation work helps my friend in no way. The Father and the Holy Spirit also took a working part in the creation of the world (Acts 4:24; Gen. 1:1–2). Now I have kept my promise and referred to all passages my opponent introduced into his third argument. I take great delight in using his own passages to expose his arguments. Now to the next argument.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT FOUR

Mr. Lewis thinks that the "Son" of God is a reference to nothing more than the fleshly body of Christ while the "Father" refers to the deity or divine part. He believes that the "Father" (the divine part) entered the "Son" (the fleshly part) sometime following Jesus' birth and left him sometime before he died on the cross. This position forces him to teach that when Jesus was born, he was no different than any other baby and that when he died he was no more than any other man. Thus, I charge Mr. Lewis with not ever believing nor teaching the atonement of deity. For, according to my friends position, the Son of God did not die on the cross because there was nothing left "of God" on the cross. He believes that according to Matthew 27:46 ("My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?") the Son (fleshly part) was without the Father (deity part) and that when Jesus died, he was no longer divine, and thus died only as a martyr for his religion—simply and solely as a man. Really, then, according to my opponent's position there was no difference in the death of Jesus and the death of any other man who would die for his religion. Mr. Lewis believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God today only as far as his humanity is concerned. Thus, I charge Mr. Lewis with not only denying the atonement of deity on the cross, but also with not even believing that Jesus is the Son of God today because he has no fleshly body. The Pentecostal position on the Godhead is an outright denial of the deity of Christ, his atonement for sin, and brings shame and dishonor to his blessed name.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT FIVE

Instead of my friend being good and accepting the truth that there are three separate and distinct individuals that compose the Godhead, he again fails miserably by attempting in this argument to

explain that one person of the Godhead is merely filling three "roles" or "positions" as a Father, as a Son, and as the Holy Spirit. But this ridiculously has Jesus as his own Father, praying to himself, sending himself into the world, ascending back to himself, sitting on his own right hand, then sending himself back to the apostles as "another" Comforter, while at the same time, he was in heaven as high priest and mediator between himself and mankind. This absurd position has Jesus saying he is greater than himself (John. 14:28), and that he came not to do his own will but to do his own will (John. 6:38). Mr. Lewis, you make the language of our Lord silly and unbelievable.

MY QUESTIONS TO MR. LEWIS:

(1) Do you believe that the men who wrote the United Pentecostal Church Manual were inspired and guided by the Holy Spirit as they wrote? (2) Do you agree or disagree with the statements in the United Pentecostal Church Manual regarding the "Oneness Movement?" If you disagree, please explain why. (3) If the Bible clearly teaches only one person in the Godhead, why did it take a special revelation in 1914 to get your brethren straightened out? (4) Are you an inspired man, Mr. Lewis? Specifically, are you guided by the Holy Spirit as you write your portion of this debate?

LEWIS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Since this is my last affirmative speech on the subject of the Godhead, we encourage all readers to continue their study of the scripture concerning the one divine nature. We also ask you to check all statements and quotations made by both Lewis and Wiggins to make sure a statement has not been misrepresented or fabricated. Mr. Wiggins' first answer to my argument number one was, "Mr. Lewis is correct" in stating the *hupostasis* of Hebrews 1:3 refers to one divine nature, substance, or nature of God. Also, Mr. Wiggins agrees that there is only one *hupostasis* meaning one divine being, one deity. Then, Mr. Wiggins fabricated a statement Lewis has never made. Mr. Wiggins said, "He (Lewis) is wrong, however, in stating that this divine nature is shared by only one person or being." Lewis never made that statement! Lewis does not believe that divine nature was shared by any person or being. Divine nature is the being and is not shared by others. God said, "My glory I will not give to another," Isaiah 42:8. Mr. Wiggins is the one that has divine nature shared by three separate distinct persons, so, persons sharing divine nature is Mr. Wiggins' problem—not mine.

I have asked you over and over to explain your three separate persons apart from divine nature. Extract divine nature from your three persons and tell the readers what you have left. I prophesy you will ignore this again. The truth is, all the Father, all of Jesus, and the Holy Spirit is divine nature, that is, all except the human nature of Jesus that he took on through the incarnation. When I say Father, Jesus, or Holy Ghost, I am speaking of the same divine being. The human nature and divine nature were fused together in the womb of Mary, making Jesus both human and divine. The reader should understand that divine nature is all the same whether in or out of the physical body of Christ.

ARGUMENT ONE—HEBREWS 1:3

I hope Mr. Wiggins does not believe an exact reproduction of himself could be three separate persons.

Common sense tells me a reproduction would look the same as the original. It's not Mr. Lewis' conclusion; it is a meaning derived from the Greek lexicon. I have just obtained a Greek lexicon by Louw and Nida (see pages 586–593) published by the United Bible Societies. According to this lexicon, *hupostasis* and *charakter* as found in Hebrews 1:3 is "an exact reproduction of a particular form or structure." They also state, "The essential or basic nature of an entity—substance, nature, essence, real being who is ... exact representation of his real being ... who is ... just like he really is." At this point, I agree with the Greek lexicons by Arndt and Gingrich, Thayer, Louw and Nida and leave you with W. E. Vines' opinion.

It is true that Hebrews one is not speaking of the English word person as we know it. The Greek word translated person is *hupostasis*—meaning substance or nature; however, it does reveal that all of divine nature is the same being regardless from where it speaks. It also reveals the divine nature is one just like the Son is one. Hebrews one lets the Jews know the God who spoke by the prophets in old times is the same God that now speaks by the son that was born. The same being or God is speaking whether by prophets or by the Son. Mr. Wiggins states, "Jesus the Son is of the same substance (deity) that God the Father is of." However, Jesus the Son also had a human nature that was not the same as the Father. JESUS THE SON increased in wisdom, Luke 2:28. JESUS THE SON can do nothing by himself, John 5:19. The SON had to be taught, he learned, did not know when he was coming (John 8:28; Hebrews 5:8; Mark 13:32).

Mr. Wiggins' absurd position has divine nature increasing in wisdom, can do nothing of himself, having to be taught, having to learn, does not know when he is coming. Mr. Wiggins, all the above terms refer to "JESUS THE SON." However, none of the above terms would apply to the divine nature. The Son was begotten, "THOU ART MY SON 'THIS DAY' HAVE BEGOTTEN THEE," Acts 13:33. Mr. Wiggins, divine nature was not begotten, divine nature is the one who begot the SON. The SON WAS BORN, Luke 1:35. I think the reader can see Mr. Wiggins' position (using Mr. Wiggins' own words) is "silly and unbelievable." Jesus had always been God; however, in addition to being God, he became a SON, a servant, through his incarnation and birth (Philippians 2:7).

"God's right hand." The Hebrews use "right hand" as a figurative expression meaning a high and exalted position of honor. Christ is depicted as seated on the right hand of majesty (Hebrews 1:3) and coming seated on the right hand of power (Mark 14:26; Luke 22:69). John 1:18 says the Son is "in the bosom of the Father." How can he sit on his right hand and be in his bosom at the same time, unless it is figurative? Jesus is sitting on his father's throne, Revelation 3:21. He is on the "right hand" of the throne, Hebrews 8:1. If this is not figurative, Mr. Wiggins has a problem.

ARGUMENT TWO

Mr. Wiggins agrees with me on Mark 12:29 when he says, "This verse is nothing more than an affirmation that there is but one God, one divine nature, one deity." It also affirms there is only one real being—that is, God. True, Jesus is quoting from Deuteronomy 6:4–5 where God was letting the people know the gods of the heathens were false gods and there was only one true divine being. Mr. Wiggins said nothing about the meaning of the Greek word "heis" (one), "A SINGLE, ONLY ONE," Arndt and Gingrich's Lexicon, page 230. You cannot be a single, only one, and be three persons at the same time. Mr. Wiggins conveniently overlooked this.

The term, "god," could also apply to any object a person would worship, as there be gods many. However, when we use the term God we are referring to the one divine being that created all. The names "FATHER," "JESUS," AND "HOLY SPIRIT" are also names the divine nature is known by. Divine nature is not known by the name "SON." SON denotes someone who was begotten, and was born. As a human birth has a set of chromosomes from both his father and his mother, so the divine nature was mixed with the human nature in the womb of Mary. On the side of his father, Jesus is God and on the side of his mother, Jesus is human. God and man fused together in the incarnation as one being.

ARGUMENT THREE

Here we proved that Jesus was God. Mr. Wiggins says, "Yes," but, when the scriptures teach "Jesus is God," they are merely teaching Jesus is divine, he is deity, just as the Father and the Holy Spirit are also God, because they too "possess the divine nature." Mr. Wiggins is in error when he says the Father and the Holy Spirit possess divine nature. The Father and the Holy Spirit "ARE THE DIVINE NATURE." THERE IS NOTHING SEPARATE AND APART FROM DIVINE NATURE IN THE FATHER, AND THE HOLY SPIRIT In John 10:30 Jesus said, "I and my Father are one."

Mr. Wiggins says this means "One in doctrine, unity, aim, and purpose." This verse also teaches Jesus and the Father are one as a being. In John 10:28, Jesus, speaking of the sheep, said, "no man shall pluck them out of my hand." in the next verse (10:29), he says, "and no man is able to

pluck them out of my Father's hand." The sheep cannot be in two persons' hands at the same time, so we conclude he is speaking of the same thing.

In John 17:20–23, Jesus wanted the believers to be one in the sense the human and divine natures were one in unity and communication. The human will, in unity with the divine will. John 17:3, Jesus, speaking of the Father, "... that they know thee the only wise God." Two of Mr. Wiggins' three persons would be unwise Gods, as the Father was the only wise one. True, when Philip saw Jesus, he did not see all of the Father; however, what he did see represented the total of what the Father was. What was seen and not seen was all the same. What was visible was the same as the invisible. What was not seen was not another person or being of some kind because Jesus was the image of the invisible, Colossians 1:15. Colossians 2:9 not only teaches God was manifest in the flesh; it also teaches other gods outside of Christ would be false gods and, therefore, a teaching of the heathen system. It also teaches the dual nature (human and divine) were one in Christ.

In John 8:24–27, the Jews did not believe Jesus was divine; their thinking was Jesus was only Mary's son. **Jesus was letting the Jews know I am, who I am, he was God as well as man.** Mr. Wiggins wants to know, "Who sent the Son? Was the Son sent as God or as man? How can God be sent where he already is? The Son was sent like all sons are sent, he was born." Because the Son was sent does not mean Jesus pre-existed as a Son. However, Jesus did pre-exist as the *LOGOS* (WORD), John 1:1. John 1:6 states, "There was a man sent from God whose name was John." John was sent, does that mean John pre-existed? If you think so, please explain. The divine nature (God) sent the Son through the incarnation. Before the incarnation, there was no son, as the Son was born. Galatians 4:4, "But when the fullness of time was come God sent forth his Son." The Son was sent in time. If you do not agree, please explain to the readers how a son can be as old as his father.

Mr. Wiggins thinks three separate distinct persons "took a working part in the creation of the world." Mr. Wiggins, you need to tell the readers what "working part" each of your persons took in the creation.

The God of the Bible says, "I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself," Isaiah 44:24. I am sure the readers can understand a person is not doing something by himself, if he has two other persons helping him.

ARGUMENT FOUR

Mr. Wiggins, the Son of God is not just a fleshly body. Jesus, the Son, is a combination or mixture of human and divine. The *Logos* (Word) which was Jesus before the incarnation was made flesh, John 1:14. And I don't believe the Father entered Jesus sometime after he was born, this belief was fabricated by Mr. Wiggins. Mary was made pregnant by divine nature, the seed of God. From the conception, there was human and divine fused together in Mary's body. Therefore, "the body of Jesus was both human and divine." It was like a little speck of divine nature being born into the world through the incarnation. The speck of divine nature confined to the body of Jesus is one and the same as divine nature outside the body. This allowed divine nature to experience death in the flesh. Death is a separation of the body and spirit. When Jesus prayed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" was this God praying to God? How can God pray to another God? Please explain. Jesus had a human spirit and will that prayed to the divine substance. Jesus never prayed as God. Who can God pray to? He prayed only as man. Instead of answering my questions, Mr. Wiggins fabricates a teaching, then answers his own

fabrication. Mr. Wiggins, Jesus still has a body today and it serves as a mediator between God and man (I Timothy 2:5).

ARGUMENT FIVE

All of Mr. Wiggins' arguments can be answered by the dual nature of Jesus. It was the human nature that prayed—God did not pray to God! The human nature was sent into the world, the human nature ascended back, the human nature is sitting on the right hand as a mediator. It was the divine nature that came back as a comforter.

As to Mr. Wiggins' questions, although all my brethren in the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI) believe in the one true God of the Bible and may agree with me, at this time I am not speaking for them, or the manual of the UPCI.

Maybe we can discuss spirit baptism later, if we can agree on a proposition. If the reader would like to further his study of the Godhead, he should obtain the book, *The Godhead* by Kenneth Reeves, 2306 Grand Avenue Granite City, IL. 62040.

IN THIS DISCUSSION WE HAVE PROVEN:

- (1) That there is only one divine being—that is, GOD.
- (2) This one divine being has only one *hupostasis* (nature) and is not shared by other beings or persons.
- (3) The Father, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit are names or titles given the one divine being.

QUESTIONS TO MR. WIGGINS

- (1) Do each of your three separate persons have their own separate *hupostasis*?
- (2) If not, please extract the *hupostasis* (divine nature) from your three persons and explain the persons apart from the one *hupostasis*.

WIGGINS' SECOND NEGATIVE

I emphatically deny that any passage of scripture in all the book of God teaches what Mr. Lewis is so bent on trying to prove in this debate. Yea, even if his life depended on it, he could not find even one verse, or part of a verse, which even hints at what his proposition says. Of course, I will not deny what the Bible teaches like my opponent, but will take pleasure in showing that all of his arguments are foreign to the gospel and thus wrong—woefully and fatally wrong. You will also note he offers no new arguments in his second. But rather he chooses to go back to repatch and rehash the same feeble arguments of his first speech. So I will now notice each of these again in order and take them from my opponent by turning them toward the light that all may see the truth on the subject at hand. Let us begin.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT ONE

I must say just now that I had to pause and literally laugh out loud when I first read the Lewis "photograph" argument. I tell you for sure he is a funny fellow. He hilariously thinks that Hebrews 1:3 teaches Christ is a "picture" of deity. And since Christ, as a picture of God, is only one individual, then there must be only one person in the Godhead—so the argument goes. But the passage, in stating that Christ is the "very image" of the Father's substance, is simply declaring that the Son possesses the divine nature and is God just as the Father also possesses the divine nature and is God. The passage is simply an affirmation of Christ's deity and helps my friend Lewis in no way whatsoever.

In fact, not only does this passage not prove what he cites it to prove, but it even denies his doctrine. The truth is, there is not a single passage in the entire New Testament more out of harmony with my friend's doctrine than this one. This verse is on my side of the debate in every way. For it teaches that Jesus the Son (who is divine, 1:3, 8) ascended back into heaven and sat down on the right hand of the Father (who also is divine). This offers proof of at least two divine individuals within the Godhead and so down goes the already failing, falling, fumbling proposition: "The Godhead consists of only one Divine being."

Mr. Lewis absurdly has Jesus ascending back to himself to sit down on his own right hand; or either, he has the Son (which Lewis thinks is a reference to the human nature only—the flesh) ascending back into heaven to sit down on the right hand of the Father (the Divine Spirit). Take note that this is the only distinction that Lewis makes in the Godhead—the distinction between flesh and spirit. Thus he thinks that this is the Father, that he (Jesus) was really nothing more than a fleshly body ascending back to the Spirit. But this is a blatant and blasphemous denial of the deity of Christ. This position makes Jesus nothing more than a man when he went back into heaven to sit on David's throne as our King and High Priest. I deny with every ounce of fiber within my body that there is even one word of truth to Lewis' Pentecostal position on this point.

These foolish speculations on the part of my opponent here put him in an embarrassing situation to which he will never be able to extricate himself. But what does he care? It is obvious to all that he despises the truth on the subject. And he seems to have forfeited all reason and common sense in attempting to uphold his oneness Pentecostal fallacies. Thus, he disqualifies himself from being any kind of a religious teacher and signs his own doom to failure in this debate. But I am elated for I have prayed fervently for his failure in this debate and am grateful to have lived to see it come to pass!

LEWIS' ARGUMENT TWO

In my first affirmative speech, at the very beginning of the debate, I made it clear to Mr. Lewis that I believe there is but one God. I emphasized that I would unreservedly accept any passage of scripture that so teaches. He knows that I believe this and he knows this is not the issue of the debate between us. Yet he continues to ignore what I have previously said and blindly blurts that "one God" means only one person within the Godhead. His problem is that he misunderstands the term "God." The word "God" is not the name of a personality; it is the name of a nature, a quality of being. It is simply a name for the Divine nature. Therefore, when the Bible affirms there is but one God, the meaning is that there is but one Divine nature, one Deity, or one Godhead.

There is a unified set of traits or characteristics that distinguish a personality as being "God." And those persons possessing these attributes are referred to as God in the Bible. So there is no contradiction whatsoever in the biblical teaching that there is but **ONE** divine nature or one God, but **THREE** distinct personalities possessing this unified set of infinite qualities. The three distinct personalities who share this one divine nature are characterized in the Bible as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Is it possible that Lewis does not know what to say in answer to this argument? Is it possible that he continues to say the same thing over and over without any notice of my negative argument just to fill space and waste time? Poor fellow. I truly feel sorry for him, but he refuses to accept the truth and rebelliously persists in the error of his way so I cannot help it. But I am not angry and shall continue to expose him on everything he offers.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE

Mr. Lewis thinks that because John 10:30 and 17:20–23 state that Jesus and the Father are "one," that this means they must be one in person. But everybody knows that persons and things can be one in one sense and more than one in another sense. For example, God has declared that husband and wife are one—but this certainly does not mean that they are one person. They are still two separate persons, yet in another sense they are one. But given Mr. Lewis' argument, this would make he and his wife the identical same person. Thus, for all I know, I may be debating with Mrs. Lewis! Who has been writing the Lewis speeches? Is my opponent a Mister or a Sister? I tell you the truth, it is fun debating with Billy Lewis, but he alone is responsible for the fun!

LEWIS' ARGUMENT FOUR

In Mr. Lewis' first affirmative speech, his "argument four" was really not even an argument at all. But rather it was a desperate and futile attempt to explain the preposterous Pentecostal position on how Jesus (when on earth) could be human and divine, and at the same time how the Father (in heaven) could also be divine and yet there still be only one divine person in the Godhead. But when I pointed out that Jesus, who was both human and divine, was on earth and his Father, who also was divine, was in heaven, and that this made at least two separate persons possessing the divine nature—thus two persons in the Godhead, Mr. Lewis immediately realized the predicament this placed him in, and so came back with the foolish "speck" argument as a reply in his second speech. He says that Jesus was "like a little speck of divine nature being born into the world through incarnation." Eh?

Lewis now says that Jesus had just a little speck, an itty bitty pinch, of the divine nature. But in his first affirmative, under his second argument, he used Colossians 2:9 to try and prove Jesus was the only person in the Godhead because "in him dwelleth **all the fullness** of the Godhead bodily." Thus, in one speech Mr. Lewis says Jesus contains "all the fullness" of the divine nature. Then in his next speech, he changes his mind and says Jesus contained just a "little speck" of the divine nature. Now, Mr. Lewis, which is it? Did Jesus contain bodily "all the fullness" or just a "little speck" of deity? No dodging now. Be good and confess your hopeless contradiction. Everybody knows it is characteristic of all false teachers to contradict themselves in debate. Mr. Lewis, of course, is no exception.

I am truly ashamed for my friend. Of all the things he has said in this debate, this has got to be the silliest, the weakest, the most ridiculous, and the most unscriptural thing I have ever heard in my entire life. Dear reader, do you suppose that even the devils in hell ever dreamed up a more heinous doctrine than this advocated by Billy Lewis? But this is what you must believe in order to be in fellowship with my friend and the United Pentecostal Church. And the sad thing about the whole matter is that Mr. Lewis is of age, he knows better. But now even the little children will laugh at his blunderous argument—"a little speck of divine nature" —Bah! Now Mr. Lewis, you must be good and take the medicine here. I know it is strong and I am sorry but I cannot help it, for you measured the dose yourself.

LEWIS' ARGUMENT FIVE

This was Mr. Lewis' argument to prove that "the Holy Spirit is God." But this we do not deny. However, he further says, "There is not one passage of scripture that shows the Holy Spirit is a separate being from the Father and the Word." But I know that there is, Read it: "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I have said unto you" (John 14:26). Note here that the Father (one divine person) would send the Holy Spirit (another divine person) to bring to the apostles' remembrance what Jesus (another divine person) had taught them. Here are the three persons in the Godhead, not just one as my opponent thinks, but three.

Mr. Lewis thinks he can answer all of my negative arguments by referring to the dual nature of Jesus. He attempts to explain away everything I say by this. He thinks that everything the Son did in relation to the Father was only the flesh doing it to the Spirit. For example, when Jesus prayed to the Father, Lewis says this was only the human nature praying to the divine nature; and when Jesus was sent into the world it was only the divine nature sending the human nature; and in the ascension it was only the human nature ascending into heaven back to the divine nature. Of course, I insist this is nothing more than a denial of the deity of Christ and makes the Son of God nothing more than a mere man—just a fleshly body. Not only so, but I think the "oneness" doctrine that I am refuting is really an insult to all intelligent readers of God's word; in fact, I am certain this is true.

But now I beg my friend to carefully note that the Bible shows there is active relation between two divine persons where **no human nature** at all is involved. In John 14:26 the Bible says that the Father in heaven (who is divine without any human nature) would send the Holy Spirit (who also is divine without any human nature), The Holy Spirit was to be **sent forth** by the Father and to come **from** the Father in heaven to the apostles on earth (Cf. Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8). Thus, here you have one divine person **sending** another divine person from one place to another and yet no human nature is involved whatsoever. Now, what about it, Lewis? Your "dual nature" loophole has been taken from you and still you have one divine person acting in relation to

another divine person. So here are at least two divine persons of the Godhead and my opponent loses out again. I tell you for sure, it is really a picnic to expose these counterfeits. But really it is not me, but the truth of God's word that is the victor here.

THE UNPROVED PROPOSITION:

"Resolved: The Scripture teaches that the Godhead consists of only one Divine Being." There is not one single solitary individual upon the face of God's green earth that is able to prove the above proposition from the Bible; no, not even Mr. Billy Lewis. Try as he may, he has not, could not, and never will be able to devise a scriptural argument that evidences only one divine being in the Godhead. It is an unprovable proposition because the Bible nowhere teaches such. It is simply not a part of God's truth. The Bible does teach, however, that there is One, Perfect, Eternal, Divine, essence who alone is the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe. And, that this one divine essence or nature belongs equally to three separate and distinct persons designated in the Bible as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

(1) But now in conclusion I must emphasize that it has not been enough for Mr. Lewis to set forth from the Bible that there is only one God. This we do not deny but rather insist is true. This does not prove his proposition—for this proves only that there is one divine nature. (2) Nor was it enough to simply prove that Jesus is divine. This, again, we do not deny. We fully believe in and accept the deity of Christ. But to say, as my opponent did, that because Christ is divine, he is the only person in the Godhead does not follow. (3) Nor was it sufficient to merely prove the dual nature of Christ—that he was both human and divine. (4) Neither was it enough to prove that the Holy Spirit is divine. This we believe and said ourselves in my first affirmative. (5) And last, it was not enough to prove that the Father and Son are one. They are one in one sense, but obviously Not one in person as my friend thinks. These live points summarize the five arguments my opponent advanced in this debate. Yet, each of his five arguments has fallen short of proving that "the Godhead consists of only one divine being." This is what he was obligated to prove. This was his responsibility and yet he failed miserably to accomplish the task. He seemingly forgot that the word "only" was in his proposition. And despite his good intentions, every passage he introduced into the debate was turned against him and shown to be on the side that I was representing—the side of God's truth!